

**Remarks/Arguments**

**35 U.S.C. §102**

Claims 1-4, 9-12, and 17-20, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Okamura (U.S. Patent No. 5,483,685).

It is respectfully asserted that Okamura fails to teach or suggest the steps of:

“storing first data representing said first digit within one of a first predetermined time interval for a first region and a second predetermined time interval for a second region; and processing said first data for selecting said broadcast program, wherein said first predetermined time interval and said second predetermined time interval are non-zero time intervals,”

as recited by the amended claim 1.

The present invention teaches a system where broadcast program selection may be performed differently depending upon the applicable region and/or broadcast source. For example, different predetermined time intervals may be used when performing broadcast program selection, depending upon the applicable region and/or broadcast source. Data indicating the applicable region and/or broadcast source may also be stored in memory during the manufacture of apparatus.

A problem addressed in the subject application is need for different channel selection techniques in different regions, specifically where different regions use different numbers of channels in their television systems. To solve this problem, the present invention uses different predetermined time intervals for different regions. A first predetermined time interval such as 1 second or other time interval may, for example, be used for time interval T1 in a first region (e.g., Europe/Asia, first service provider region, etc.), or a longer, second predetermined time interval, such as 1.5 seconds or other time interval, may be used for time interval T1 in a second region (e.g., North America/South America, second service provider region, etc.).

Okamura does not describe the use of different non-zero time intervals based upon region. In contrast, the goal of Okamura is to eliminate the pause before changing channels when it can be inferred that the channel number entry is complete. In a system where the maximum channel number only has two digits, the “reference counting value” is set to “2”

and the system does not wait the fixed time “T” after entry of the second digit. While Okamura describes the use of different reference count values based upon the number of available channels, it does not describe the use of different time values based upon region. Okamura describes a fixed time interval:

“The selection lag-time T is about 2.3 seconds, for example, and is equal to the selection lag-time T in the description of the related art.” (Okamura, column 3, lines 43-45)

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that Okamura fails to disclose the use of two non-zero predetermined time intervals, as described in currently amended claim 1.

In view of the above remarks and amendments to the claims, it is respectfully asserted that there is no 35 USC 112 enabling disclosure provided by Okamura that makes the present invention as claimed in claim 1 unpatentable. It is further submitted that currently amended independent claims 9 and 17 are allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable. Since dependent claims 2-8, 10-16, and 18-24 are dependent from allowable claims 1, 9, and 17, it is submitted that they too are allowable for at least the same reasons that their respective independent claims are allowable. Thus, it is further respectfully submitted that this rejection has been satisfied and should be withdrawn.

### **35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 5-7, 13-15, and 21-23, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Okamura (U.S. Patent No. 5,483,685), in view of Applicant’s admitted prior art.

Claims 8, 16, and 24, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Okamura (U.S. Patent No. 5,483,685).

As claims 5-7, 13-15, 21-23, 8, 16, and 24 are dependent upon claims 1, 9, and 17, which are allowable for the reasons described above, it is respectfully asserted that they too are allowable for at least the same reasons. Thus, it is further respectfully submitted that this rejection has been satisfied and should be withdrawn.

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's representative at (609) 734-6804, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

No fee is believed due. However, if a fee is due, please charge the additional fee to Deposit Account 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,

/brian j cromarty/

By: Brian J Cromarty  
Reg. No. L0027  
Phone (609) 734-6804

Patent Operations  
Thomson Licensing Inc.  
P.O. Box 5312  
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312  
October 1, 2008